

Appln No. 10/613,494

Amdt date May 5, 2006

Reply to Office action of February, 8, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1, 2, 4 - 7, and 9 - 18 are pending of which claims 1, 7, and 15 are independent. Claims 1, 7, 10, 12, and 15 - 18 are amended.

The Examiner has made the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, and 16 are rejected as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0175883 to Onozawa; Claims 4, 11, 12, 17, and 18 are rejected over Onozawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,670,974 to Ohba; and Claims 5 and 13 are rejected over Onozawa in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0033675 to Kang.

The Applicant's amended Claim 1 now calls for "wherein the third voltage is substantially a ground voltage." (Emphasis added). In item 6 on page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner agrees with the Applicant that Onozawa does not accomplish any of what it sets out to accomplish if $V_w=0$. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Onozawa. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Onozawa.

Claims 2 and 4 - 6 are dependent on Claim 1. As such, these claims are believed allowable based upon Claim 1.

The Applicant's amended Claim 7 calls for "wherein a ground voltage is applied to the first signal line while the second

Appln No. 10/613,494

Amdt date May 5, 2006

Reply to Office action of February, 8, 2006

voltage is applied to the first terminal of the panel capacitor." The Applicant submits that Claim 7 is patentable over Onozawa for reasons similar to those presented for Claim 1.


Claims 9 - 14 are dependent on Claim 7. As such, these claims are believed allowable based upon Claim 7.

The Applicant's amended Claim 15 calls for "applying a ground voltage to the first common contact while the second voltage is being applied to the first terminal of the panel capacitor." The Applicant submits that Claim 15 is patentable over Onozawa for reasons similar to those presented for Claim 1.

Claims 16 - 18 are dependent on Claim 15. As such, these claims are believed allowable based upon Claim 15.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the above Application and allowance of all of the pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Fariba Sirjani
Reg. No. 47,947
626/795-9900

CAH PAS676803.2--05/5/06 10:52 AM